	Case 3:23-cv-03461-TLT Document 67 Filed	1 04/09/24	Page 1 of 5
1	Kate Mueting, DC Bar No. 988177* Dacey Romberg, DC Bar No. 90003767*		
2	2 Samone Ijoma, MD Bar No. 2012170086*		
3	SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP 3 700 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 300		
4	Washington, DC 20003		
5	kmueting@sanfordheisler.com		
6	dromberg@sanfordheisler.com		
7	7 Charles Field, SBN 189817		
8	SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP		
9	La Jolla, CA 92037		
10	Telephone: (619) 577-4252		
11			
12	SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP		
13	Nashville, TN 37203		
14	Telephone: (615) 434-7008		
15	SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP		
16	Deltimara Maryland 21202		
17	Telephone: (410) 834-7422		
18	8 cowens@sanfordheisler.com		
19	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Potential Class		
20	0		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			e No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT-RMI
	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LE	LAVE IUI	TILE SUK-KEPLY

	Case 3:23-cv-03461-TLT Document 67 F	Filed 04/09/24 Page 2 of 5			
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT			
9	DISTRICT OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION				
10	SANTIANCISC	O DIVISION			
11	COURTNEY MCMILLIAN and RONALD	Case No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT-RMI			
12	COOPER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,				
13	Plaintiffs,	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR			
14	v.	LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY			
15		Hon. Trina L. Thompson			
16	X CORP., f/k/a/ TWITTER, INC., X HOLDINGS, ELON MUSK, DOES,	Date: June 18, 2024			
17	Defendants.	2:00 pm PT			
18		Magistrate Judge: Robert M. Illman			
19					
20	Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-3(d) and 7-11, Plaintiffs respectfully submit this Motion				
21	for Leave to File a Sur-Reply in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, attached here as				
22	"Exhibit A."				
2324	Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint on January 9, 2024. Dkt. 38. On February 9, Plaintiffs filed their Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss				
25	Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. Dkt. 45. On February 23, Defendants filed a Reply in Support of				
26	their Motion to Dismiss ("Reply"). Dkt. 50. The Reply raises new arguments that were not raised				
27	in the opening papers. Specifically, Defendants argue for the first time that the Court should not				
28					
	Case No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT-RMI ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY				

Case 3:23-cv-03461-TLT Document 67 Filed 04/09/24 Page 3 of 5

1 consider the "Severance Matrix." Reply at 5. Defendants also raise the new argument that by 2 referencing the Merger Agreement, Plaintiffs' ERISA Section 502(a)(2) claim was morphed into 3 a state law claim for breach of contract which fails because Plaintiffs are not third-party 4 beneficiaries of the Merger Agreement. Reply at 6, 8-9. 5 Plaintiffs intended to address the new arguments at the April 9th hearing. Dkt. 58. However, on April 3rd, the Court vacated the hearing. Dkt. 65. Therefore, Plaintiffs request that 6 7 the Court ignore Defendants' new arguments that were inappropriately raised in their Reply or 8 grant Plaintiffs' leave to file a short four-page sur-reply in order to respond to the new 9 arguments. U.S. v. Romm, 455 F.3d 990, 997 (9th Cir. 2006) (declining to consider argument first raised in a reply); Dytch v. Yoon, 2011 WL 839421, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 7, 2011) ("It is 10 11 improper for a moving party to introduce new facts or different legal arguments in the reply brief 12 than those presented in the moving papers") (internal citations omitted); Banga v. First USA, NA, 13 29 F. Supp. 3d 1270, 1276 (N.D. Cal. 2014) ("If a party raises a new argument or presents new 14 evidence in a reply brief, a court may consider these matters only if the adverse party is given an 15 opportunity to respond") (internal citations omitted); Tanious v. Gattoni, 533 F. Supp. 3d 770 16 (N.D. Cal. April 8, 2021) (granting leave to file a sur-reply to respond to argument raised in 17 reply brief for the first time). 18 Complaint is attached as Exhibit A. 19

Plaintiffs' proposed Sur-Reply to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT-RMI

	Case 3:23-cv-03461-TLT	Document 67	Filed 04/09/24	Page 4 of 5	
1	DATED: April 9, 2024		Respectfully s	ubmitted,	
2			Sanford Heisle	er Sharp, LLP	
3				Stahnke McGregor	
4			Kristi Stahnke 674012	McGregor, GA Bar No.	
5			(admitted <i>pro</i> SANFORD H	hac vice) EISLER SHARP, LLP	
6				e Street, Suite 3100	
7			Telephone: (61		
8					
9			Attorney for Pand the Potent		
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18 19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28			~	N. 222 - 02461 TV T D. G	
	Case No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT-RMI ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY				
	4				

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 2 I hereby certify that on April 9, 2024, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of 3 the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send a copy of this filing to all counsel of 4 record. Mark A. Feller 5 Melissa D. Hill Jared R. Killeen 6 Sean K. McMahan 7 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 8 mark.feller@morganlewis.com melissa.hill@morganlewis.com 9 jared.killeen@morganlewis.com sean.mcmahan@morganlewis.com 10 11 Attorneys for Defendants X Corp., X Holdings, and Elon Musk 12 13 14 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the 15 foregoing is true and correct. 16 DATED: April 9, 2024 /s/ Kristi Stahnke McGregor 17 Kristi Stahnke McGregor, GA Bar No. 18 674012 (admitted pro hac vice) 19 SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP 611 Commerce Street, Suite 3100 20 Nashville, TN 37203 Telephone: (615) 434-7008 21 kmcgregor@sanfordheisler.com 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 Case No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT-RMI

Case 3:23-cv-03461-TLT Document 67 Filed 04/09/24 Page 5 of 5